arXiv:math/9209208v1 [math.LO] 25 Sep 1992

Meager-nowhere dense games (III): Remainder strategies.

Marion Scheepers*
Department of Mathematics,
Boise State University,
Boise, Idaho 83725

Abstract

Player ONE chooses a meager set and player TWO, a nowhere dense set per inning. They play ω many innings. ONE's consecutive choices must form a (weakly) increasing sequence. TWO wins if the union of the chosen nowhere dense sets covers the union of the chosen meager sets. A strategy of TWO which depends on knowing only the uncovered part of the most recently chosen meager set is said to be a remainder strategy. TWO has a winning remainder strategy for this game played on the real line with its usual topology.

1 Introduction

A variety of topological games from the class of meager-nowhere dense games were introduced in the papers [B-J-S], [S1] and [S2]. The existence of winning strategies which use only the most recent move of either player (so-called coding strategies) and the existence of winning strategies which use only a bounded number of moves of the opponent as information (so-called k-tactics) are studied there and in [K] and [S3]. These studies are continued here for yet another fairly natural type of strategy, the so-called *remainder strategy*.

The texts [E-H-M-R] and [W] would be sufficient references for the miscellaneous results from combinatorial set theory which we use. As for notation: The symbol $J_{\mathbb{R}}$ denotes the ideal of nowhere dense subsets of the real line (with its usual topology), while the symbol "$\subset$" is used exclusively to denote " is a proper subset of ". The symbol "$\subseteq$" is used to denote " is a subset of, possibly equal to". Let (S,τ) be a T_1-space without isolated points, and let J be its ideal of nowhere-dense subsets. The symbol $\langle J\rangle$ denotes the collection of meager subsets of the space. For Y a subset of S, the symbol $J\lceil_Y$ denotes the set $\{T\in J: T\subseteq Y\}$.

---

[*] Supported in part by Idaho State Board of Education grant 91-093.

The game $WMEG(J)$ (defined in [S2]) proceeds as follows: In the first inning player ONE chooses a meager set M_1, and player TWO responds with a nowhere dense set N_1. In the second inning player ONE chooses a meager set M_2, subject to the rule that $M_1 \subseteq M_2$; TWO responds with a nowhere dense set N_2, and so on. The players play an inning for each positive integer, thus constructing a sequence

$$(M_1, N_1, \ldots, M_k, N_k, \ldots)$$

which has the properties that $M_k \subseteq M_{k+1} \in \langle J \rangle$, and $N_k \in J$ for each k. Such a sequence is said to be a *play of* $WMEG(J)$. Player TWO wins such a play if

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} N_k.$$

A strategy of player TWO of the form

1. $N_1 = F(M_1)$ and
2. $N_{k+1} = F(M_{k+1} \backslash (\bigcup_{j=1}^{k} N_j))$ for all k

is said to be a *remainder strategy.* When does TWO have a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMEG(J)$?

It is clear that TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J)$ if $J = \langle J \rangle$. The situation when $J \subset \langle J \rangle \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$ is not so easy. In Section 2 we investigate this question. We prove among other things Theorem 1, which implies that TWO has a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMEG(J_{\mathbb{R}})$.

The game $WMG(J)$ proceeds just like $WMEG(J)$; only now the winning condition on TWO is relaxed so that TWO wins if

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} N_n.$$

In Section 3 we study remainder strategies for this game; we briefly also discuss the game $SMG(J)$ here. In Section 4 we attend to the version $VSG(J)$. The rules of this game turns out to be more advantageous to TWO from the point of view of existence of winning remainder strategies. Some of the theorems in these two sections show that the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are to some extent necessary.

Theorem 12 is due to Winfried Just, while Theorem 16 is due to Fred Galvin. I thank Professors Galvin and Just for kindly permitting me to present their result here and for fruitful conversations and correspondence concerning remainder strategies.

2 The weakly monotonic equal game, $WMEG(J)$.

When defining a remainder strategy F for TWO in $WMEG(J)$, we shall take care that for each $A \in \langle J \rangle$:

1. $F(A) \subseteq A$, and

2. $F(A) \neq \emptyset$ if (and only if) $A \neq \emptyset$.

Otherwise, the strategy F is sure not to be a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $WMEG(J)$,

Theorem 1 *If* $(\forall X \in \langle J\rangle \setminus J)(cof(\langle J\rangle, \subset) \leq |J\lceil_X|)$*, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in* $WMEG(J)$*.*

Theorem 1 follows from the next two lemmas. In the proof of Lemma 2 we use an auxilliary game, denoted $REG(J)$. It is played as follows: A sequence

$$(M_1, N_1, \dots, M_k, N_k, \dots)$$

is a play of $REG(J)$ if $M_k \in \langle J\rangle$ and $N_k \in J$ for each k. Player TWO is declared the winner of a play of $REG(J)$ if $\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k = \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} N_k$. TWO has a winning perfect information strategy in $REG(J)$. (We call $REG(J)$ the "random equal game on J".)

Lemma 2 *If*

1. $cof(\langle J\rangle, \subset)$ *is infinite and*
2. $(\forall X \in \langle J\rangle \setminus J)(cof(\langle J\rangle, \subset) \leq |J\lceil_X|)$,

then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J)$*.*

Proof Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \langle J\rangle \setminus J$ be a cofinal family of minimal cardinality. Observe that $|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\mathcal{P}(X)|$ for each $X \in \langle J\rangle \setminus J$. Thus, if there is no $Y \in J\lceil_X$ such that $|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\mathcal{P}(Y)|$, then $|Y| < |X|$ for each $Y \in J\lceil_X$, and we fix a decomposition

$$X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$$

where $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a disjoint collection of sets from $\langle J\rangle \setminus J$. For each such X_n we further fix a representation

$$X_n = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} X_{n,m}$$

where $X_{n,1} \subseteq X_{n,2} \subseteq \dots$ are from J, and a surjection

$$\Theta_n^X : J\lceil_{X_n} \to {}^{<\omega}\mathcal{A}.$$

For each $Y \in J$ such that $|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\mathcal{P}(Y)|$ the set Y is infinite and we also write

$$Y = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} Y_n$$

where $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a pairwise disjoint collection such that $|Y_n| = |Y|$ for each n. Further, choose for each n a surjection

$$\Psi_n^Y : \mathcal{P}(Y_n) \setminus \{\emptyset, Y_n\} \to {}^{<\omega}\mathcal{A}.$$

Let U and V be sets in $\langle J\rangle$ such that we have chosen a decomposition $U = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n$ as above. We'll use the notation

$$U \subseteq^* V$$

to denote that there is an m such that $U_n \subseteq V$ for each $n \geq m$; we say that m *witnesses that* $U \subseteq^* V$.

Fix a well-ordering $\prec$ of $\langle J\rangle$. For $X \in \langle J\rangle$ we define:

1. $\Theta(X)$: the $\prec$-minimal element A of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $X \subseteq A$,
2. $\Phi(X)$: the $\prec$-minimal element Z of $\langle J\rangle \backslash J$ such that $Z \subseteq^* X$ whenever this is defined, and the empty set otherwise,
3. $k(X)$: the minimal natural number which witnesses that $\Phi(X) \subseteq^* X$ whenever $\Phi(X) \neq \emptyset$, and 0 otherwise,
4. $\Gamma(X)$: the $\prec$-minimal $Y \in J$ such that $|J\lceil_X| \leq |\mathcal{P}(Y)|$ and $Y \subseteq^* X$ whenever this is defined, and the empty set otherwise, and
5. $m(X)$: the minimal natural number which witnesses that $\Gamma(X) \subseteq^* X$ whenever $\Gamma(X) \neq \emptyset$, and 0 otherwise.

Let G be a winning perfect information strategy for TWO in the game $REG(J)$. We are now ready to define TWO's remainder strategy

$$F : \langle J\rangle \rightarrow J.$$

Let $B \in \langle J\rangle$ be given.

$B \in J$: Then we define $F(B) = B$.

$B \notin J$: We distinguish between two cases:

Case 1: $\Gamma(B) = \emptyset$.

Write X for $\Phi(B)$ and $n+1$ for $k(B)$. For $1 \leq j \leq n$ define σ_j so that

$$\sigma_j = \begin{cases} \Theta_j^X(X_j \backslash B) & \text{if } X_j \backslash B \in J \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let τ be $\sigma_1 \frown \ldots \frown \sigma_n \frown \langle\Theta(B)\rangle$, the concatenation of these finite sequences, and choose $V \in J\lceil_{X_{n+1}}$ such that $\Theta_{n+1}^X(V) = \tau$. Then define

$$F(B) = B \cap [X_{1,n+1} \cup \ldots \cup X_{n,n+1} \cup V \cup ((\cup\{G(\sigma) : \sigma \subseteq \tau\}) \backslash X)].$$

Case 2: $\Gamma(B) \neq \emptyset$.

Write Y for $\Gamma(B)$ and $n+1$ for $m(B)$. For $1 \leq j \leq n$ define σ_j so that

$$\sigma_j = \begin{cases} \Psi_j^Y(Y_j \backslash B) & \text{if } Y_j \backslash B \notin \{\emptyset, Y_j\} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let τ be $\sigma_1 \frown \ldots \frown \sigma_n \frown \langle\Theta(B)\rangle$, the concatenation of these finite sequences, and choose $V \in \mathcal{P}(Y_{n+1}) \backslash \{\emptyset, Y_{n+1}\}$ so that $\Psi_{n+1}^Y(V) = \tau$. Then define

$$F(B) = B \cap [Y_1 \cup \ldots \cup Y_n \cup V \cup ((\cup\{G(\sigma) : \sigma \subseteq \tau\}) \backslash Y)].$$

From its definition it is clear that $F(B) \subseteq B$ for each $B \in \langle J \rangle$. To see that F is a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $WMEG(J)$, consider a play

$$(M_1, N_1, \dots, M_k, N_k, \dots)$$

during which TWO adhered to the strategy F. To facilitate the exposition we write:

1. B_1 for M_1 and B_{j+1} for $M_{j+1} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{j} N_i$,
2. Y^j for $\Gamma(B_j)$,
3. X^j for $\Phi(B_j)$,
4. A^j for $\Theta(B_j)$,
5. k_j for $k(B_j)$ and
6. m_j for $m(B_j)$.

We must show that $\cup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^{\infty} N_j$.

We may assume that $B_j \notin J$ for each j.

Suppose that $Y^{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ for some j. Then N_{j+1} is defined by Case 2, and as such is of the form

$$B_{j+1} \cap [Y_1^{j+1} \cup \dots \cup Y_{m_{j+1}-1}^{j+1} \cup V_{j+1} \cup ((\cup\{G(\sigma) : \sigma \subseteq \tau_{j+1}\}) \setminus Y^{j+1})]$$

where V_{j+1} and τ_{j+1} have the obvious meanings. Now $B_{j+1} \setminus B_{j+2} = N_{j+1}$, and thus:

- $Y^{j+1} \subseteq^* B_{j+2}$ is a candidate for Y^{j+2}, and
- $Y^{j+2} \neq \emptyset$, so that N_{j+2} is also defined by Case 2.

We conclude that if $Y^j \neq \emptyset$ for some j, then $Y^i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \geq j$. Moreover, it then also follows that $Y^{i+1} \preceq Y^i$ for each $i \geq j$. Since $\prec$ is a well-order, there is a fixed k such that $Y^i = Y^k$ for all $i \geq k$. Let Y be this common value of $Y^i, i \geq k$. An inductive computation now shows that $(A^k, \dots, A^j) \subseteq \tau_j$ for each $j \geq k$. But then

$$B_j \cap [(G(A^k) \cup \dots \cup G(A^k, \dots, A^j)) \setminus Y] \subseteq N_j$$

for each $j \geq k$. It follows that $\cup_{j=k}^{\infty} B_j \setminus Y \subseteq \cup_{j=k}^{\infty} N_j$. But it is also clear that $Y \cap (\cup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j) \subseteq \cup_{j=k}^{\infty} N_j$. It then follows from the monotonicity of the sequence of M_j-s that TWO has won this play.

The other case to consider is that $Y^{j+1} = \emptyset$ for all j. In this case, $X^{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ for each j, and N_{j+1} is defined by Case 1. In this case N_{j+1} is of the form:

$$B_{j+1} \cap [X_{1,k_{j+1}}^{j+1} \cup \dots \cup X_{k_{j+1}-1,k_{j+1}}^{j+1} \cup V_{j+1} \cup ((\cup\{G(\sigma) : \sigma \subseteq \tau_{j+1}\}) \setminus X^{j+1})],$$

where V_{j+1} and τ_{j+1} have the obvious meaning. Now $B_{j+1} \setminus B_{j+2} = N_{j+1}$, and so $X^{j+1} \subseteq^* B_{j+2}$, and X^{j+1} is a candidate for X^{j+2}. It follows that $X^{j+2} \preceq X^{j+1}$ for each $j < \omega$. Since $\prec$ is a well-order we once again fix k such that $X^j = X^k$ for all $j \geq k$. Let X denote X^k. As before, $\langle A^k, \dots, A^j \rangle \subseteq \tau_j$ for each such j, and it follows that TWO also won these plays. ■

Lemma 3 *If $\langle J\rangle = \mathcal{P}(S)$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J)$.*

Proof Let $\prec$ be a well-order of $\mathcal{P}(S)$, and write $S = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} S_n$ such that $S_n \in J$ for each n, and the S_n-s are pairwise disjoint. For each countably infinite $Y \in J$ write $Y = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} Y_n$ so that $|Y_n| = n$ for each n, and $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is pairwise disjoint. For X and Y in $\langle J\rangle$ write $Y \subseteq^* X$ if $Y\backslash X$ is finite.

For each $X \in \langle J\rangle\backslash J$,

- either there is an infinite $Y \in J\lceil_X$,
- or else X is countably infinite.

In the first of these cases, let $\Phi(X)$ be the $\prec$-first countable element Y of J such that $Y \subseteq^* X$, and let $m(X)$ be the smallest n such that $Y_m \subseteq X$ for all $m \geq n$.

In the second of these cases, let $\Phi(X)$ be the $\prec$-least element Y of $\langle J\rangle\backslash J$ such that $Y \subseteq^* X$, and let $m(X)$ be the minimal n such that $\Phi(X) \cap S_m \subseteq X$ for all $m \geq n$. Also write $\Phi(X)_j$ for $\Phi(X) \cap S_j$ for each j, in this case.

Then define $F(X)$ so that

1. $F(X) = X$ if $X \in J$, and
2. $F(X) = X \cap [(S_1 \cup \ldots \cup S_{m(X)})\backslash\Phi(X)) \cup (\Phi(X)_1 \cup \ldots \cup \Phi(X)_{m(X)}]$

Then F is a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $WMEG(J)$, for reasons analogous to those in the proof of Lemma 2. ■

Corollary 4 *Player TWO has a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMEG(J_{\mathbb{R}})$.*

Recall (from [S2]) that G is a coding strategy for TWO if:

1. $N_1 = G(\emptyset, M_1)$ and
2. $N_{k+1} = G(N_k, M_{k+1})$ for each k.

If F is a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $WMEG(J)$, then the function G which is defined so that $G(W, B) = W \cup F(B\backslash W)$ is a winning coding strategy for TWO in $WMEG(J)$. Thus, Corollary 4 solves Problem 2 of [S2] positively.

We shall later see that the sufficient condition for the existence of a winning coding strategy given in Theorem 1 is to some extent necessary (Theorems 12 and 16). However, this condition is not absolutely necessary, as we shall now illustrate. First, note that for any decomposition $S = \cup_{j=1}^{k} S_k$, the following statements are equivalent:

1. TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J)$,
2. For each j, TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J\lceil_{S_j})$.

Now let S be the disjoint union of the real line and a countable set S^*. Let $X \in J$ if $X \cap S^*$ is finite and $X \cap \mathbb{R} \in \mathbb{J}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $S^* \in \langle J \rangle$, and $J\lceil_{S^*}$ is a countable set, while $cof(\langle J \rangle, \subset)$ is uncountable. According to Corollary 4 and Lemma 3, TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J)$.

Let λ be an infinite cardinal of countable cofinality. For $\kappa \geq \lambda$, we declare a subset of κ to be open if it is either empty, or else has a complement of cardinality less than λ. With this topology, $J = [\kappa]^{<\lambda}$.

Corollary 5 *Let λ be a cardinal of countable cofinality, and let $\kappa > \lambda$ be a cardinal number. If $cof([\kappa]^\lambda, \subset) \leq \lambda^{<\lambda}$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG([\kappa]^{<\lambda})$.*

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subset of $\langle J \rangle$. The game $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$ is played like $WMEG(J)$, except that ONE is confined to choosing meager sets which are in $\mathcal{A}$ only. Thus, $WMEG(J)$ is the special case of $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$ for which $\mathcal{A} = \langle J \rangle$. If there is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset \langle J \rangle$ such that TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$, then TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J)$.

Theorem 6 *There is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset [\omega_1]^{\aleph_0}$ such that TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, [\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0})$.*

Proof Let F be a remainder strategy for TWO such that $F(X) \subseteq X$ for every countable subset X of ω_1. Put $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha < \omega_1 : cof(\alpha) = \omega\}$.

We show that there is a sequence

$$\langle (S_1, T_1), (S_2, T_2), \ldots \rangle$$

such that:

1. S_n is a stationary subset of ω_1,
2. T_n is a finite subset of ω_1,
3. $S_{n+1} \subseteq S_n$ for each n,
4. $F(\gamma) = T_1$ for each $\gamma \in S_1$ and
5. $F(\gamma \backslash (\cup_{j=1}^{n} T_j)) = T_{n+1}$ for each $\gamma \in S_{n+1}$ and for each n.

To establish the existence of S_1 and T_1 we argue as follows.

For each $\gamma < \omega_1$ which is of countable cofinality we put

$$\phi_1(\gamma) = \max F(\gamma)(< \gamma).$$

By Fodor's lemma there is a stationary set S_0 of countable limit ordinals, and an ordinal $\delta_0 < \min(S_0)$ such that $\phi_1(\gamma) = \delta_0$ for each $\gamma \in S_0$. But then $F(\gamma)$ is a finite subset of $\delta_0 + 1$ for each such γ. Since every partition of a stationary set into countably many sets has at least one of these sets stationary, we find a stationary set $S_{\subset} S_0$ and a finite set $T_1 \subset \delta_0 + 1$ such that $F(\gamma) = T_1$ for each $\gamma \in S_1$.

This specifies (S_1, T_1). Now let $1 \leq n < \omega$ be given and suppose that $(S_1, T_1), \ldots, (S_n, T_n)$ with properties 1 through 5 are given.

For $\gamma \in S_n$ we define:

$$\phi_{n+1}(\gamma) = \max F(\gamma \backslash (T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_n))(< \gamma).$$

Once again there is, by Fodor's Lemma, a stationary set $S' \subset S_n$ and an ordinal $\delta' < \omega - 1$ such that $\phi_{n+1}(\gamma) = \delta'$ for each $\gamma \in S'$. As before we then find a stationary set $S_{n+1} \subseteq S'$ and a finite set $T_{n+1} \subseteq \delta' + 1$ such that $F(\gamma \backslash (T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_n)) = T_{n+1}$ for each $\gamma \in S_{n+1}$.

Then $(S_1, T_1), \ldots, (S_{n+1}, T_{n+1})$ have properties 1 through 5. It follows that there is an infinite sequence of the required sort.

Put $\delta = \sup(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n)$ and choose $\gamma_n \in S_n$ such that

$$\delta < \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \gamma_3 < \ldots$$

Then $(\gamma_1, T_1, \gamma_2, T_2, \ldots)$ is an F-play of $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, [\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0})$, and is lost by TWO. ■

Though there may be cofinal families $\mathcal{A}$ such that TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$, there may for this very same J also be cofinal families $\mathcal{B} \subset \langle J \rangle$ such that TWO does have a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{B}, J)$.

Theorem 7 *Let λ be an infinite cardinal number of countable cofinality. If $\kappa > \lambda$ is a cardinal for which $cof([\kappa]^{\lambda}, \subset) = \kappa$, then there is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset [\kappa]^{\lambda}$ such that TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, [\kappa]^{<\lambda})$.*

Proof Let $(B_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa)$ bijectively enumerate a cofinal subfamily of $[\kappa]^{\lambda}$. Write

$$\kappa = \cup_{\alpha<\kappa} S_\alpha$$

where $\{S_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \subset [\kappa]^{\lambda}$ is a pairwise disjoint family.

Define: $A_\alpha = \{\alpha\} \cup (\cup_{x \in B_\alpha} S_x)$ for each $\alpha < \kappa$, and put $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is a cofinal subset of $[\kappa]^{\lambda}$. Also let $\Psi : \mathcal{A} \to \kappa$ be such that $\Psi(A_\alpha) = \alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \kappa$.

Choose a sequence $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \ldots < \lambda_n < \ldots$ of cardinal numbers converging to λ. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we write $A = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A^n$ where $A^1 \subset A^2 \subset \ldots$ are such that $|A^n| = \lambda_n$ for each n.

For convenience we write, for C and D elements of $[\kappa]^{\leq\lambda}$, that $C =^* D$ if $|C \Delta D| < \lambda$. Observe that for A and B elements of $\mathcal{A}$, $A \neq B$ if, and only if, $|A \Delta B| = \lambda$.

Now define TWO's remainder strategy F as follows:

1. $F(A) = \{\Psi(A)\} \cup A^1$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}$,
2. $F(A) = \{\Psi(B)\} \cup (\cup(\{C^{m+1} : \Psi(C) \in \Gamma(A)\}) \cap B) \cup B^{m+1}$ if $A \notin \mathcal{A}$ but $A \subset B$ and $A =^* B$ for some $B \in \mathcal{A}$. Observe that this B is unique. In this definition, $\Gamma(A) = B \backslash A$, and m is minimal such that $|\Gamma(A)| \leq \lambda_m$.

3. $F(A) = \emptyset$ in all other cases.

Observe that $|F(A)| < \lambda$ for each A, so that F is a legitimate strategy for TWO. To see that F is indeed a winning remainder strategy for TWO, consider a play

$$(M_1, N_1, \ldots, M_k, N_k, \ldots)$$

of $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, [\kappa]^{<\lambda})$ during which TWO used F as a remainder strategy.

Write $M_i = A_{\alpha_i}$ for each i. By the rules of the game we have:

$$A_{\alpha_1} \subseteq A_{\alpha_2} \subseteq \ldots .$$

Also, $N_1 = \{\alpha_1\} \cup A^1_{\alpha_1}$ and n_1 minimal is such that $|N_1| \leq \lambda_{n_1}$. An inductive computation shows that $N_{k+1} = F(M_{k+1} \backslash (\cup_{j=1}^k N_j)$ is the set

$$([\{\alpha_{k+1}\} \cup (\cup\{A_\gamma^{n_k+1} : \gamma \in N_k\}) \cup A_{\alpha_{k+1}}^{n_k+1}) \cap A_{\alpha+k+1}$$

from which it follows that:

1. $N_1 \subseteq N_2 \subseteq \ldots \subseteq N_k \subseteq \ldots$,
2. $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \ldots \leq n_k \leq \ldots$ goes to infinity,
3. $\alpha_j \in N_k$ whenever $j \leq k$, and thus
4. $A^p_{\alpha_j} \subseteq N_k$ for $j \leq k$ and $p \leq n_{k-1}$.

The result follows from these remarks. ■

Theorem 7 also covers the case when $\lambda = \aleph_0$. For cofinal families $\mathcal{A} \subset \langle J \rangle$ which have the special property that

$$A \neq B \Leftrightarrow A \Delta B \notin J$$

(like the one exhibited in the above proof), there is indeed an equivalence between the existence of winning coding strategies and winning remainder strategies in the game $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$. Particularly:

Proposition 8 *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \langle J \rangle$ be a cofinal family such that for A and B elements of $\mathcal{A}$, $A \neq B \Leftrightarrow A \Delta B \notin J$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *TWO has a winning coding strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$.*
2. *TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$.*

Proof We must verify that 1 implies 2. Thus, let F be a winning coding strategy for TWO in the game $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$. We define a remainder strategy G. Let X be given. If $X \in \mathcal{A}$ we define $G(X) = F(\emptyset, X)$. If $X \notin \mathcal{A}$ but there is an $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $X \subset A$ and $X =^* A$, then by the property of $\mathcal{A}$ there is a unique such A and we set $T = A \backslash X (\in J)$. In this case define $G(X) = F(T, A)$. In all other cases we put $G(X) = \emptyset$. Then G is a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, J)$. ■

It is not always the case that there is a cofinal $\mathcal{A} \subset \langle J \rangle$ which satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 8. For example, let $J \subset \mathcal{P}(\omega_2)$ be defined so that $X \in J$ if, and only if, $X \cap \omega$ is finite and $X \cap (\omega_2 \backslash \omega)$ has cardinality at most $\aleph_1$. Let $\{S_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ be a cofinal family. Choose $\alpha \neq \beta \in \omega_2$ such that:

1. $\omega \subset (S_\alpha \cap S_\beta)$ and
2. $S_\alpha \neq S_\beta$.

Then $S_\alpha \Delta S_\beta \in J$.

Coupled with Theorem 7 and an assumption about cardinal arithmetic, the following Lemma (left to the reader) enables us to conclude much more.

Lemma 9 *Let λ be a cardinal of countable cofinality, let $\mu \leq \lambda$ be a regular cardinal number, and let $\{S_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$ be a collection of pairwise disjoint sets such that for each $\alpha < \mu$ there is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A}_\alpha \subset [S_\alpha]^\lambda$ for which TWO has a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMEG(\mathcal{A}_\alpha, [S_\alpha]^{<\lambda})$. Then there is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset [\cup_{\alpha<\mu} S_\alpha]^\lambda$ such that TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, [\cup_{\alpha<\mu} S_\alpha]^{<\lambda})$.*

Corollary 10 *Assume the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis. Let λ be a cardinal of countable cofinality. For every infinite set S there is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset [S]^\lambda$ such that TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(\mathcal{A}, [S]^{<\lambda})$.*

It is clear that if TWO has a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMEG(J)$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMG(J)$. The converse of this assertion is not so clear.

Problem 1 *Is it true that if TWO has a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMG(J)$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMEG(J)$?*

3 The strongly monotonic game, $SMG(J)$.

A sequence $(M_1, N_1, \ldots, M_k, N_k, \ldots)$ is a play of the strongly monotonic game if:

1. $M_k \cup N_k \subseteq M_{k+1} \in \langle J \rangle$, and
2. $N_k \in J$ for each k.

Player TWO wins such a play if $\cup_{j=1}^\infty M_j = \cup_{j=1}^\infty N_j$. This game was studied in [B-J-S] and [S1]; from the point of view of TWO this gives TWO a little more control over how ONE's meager sets increase as the game progresses. It is clear that if TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMG(J)$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $SMG(J)$. The converse is also true, showing that in the context of remainder strategies, the more stringent requirements placed on ONE by the rules of the strongly monotonic game is not of any additional strategic value for TWO:

Lemma 11 *If TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $SMG(J)$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMG(J)$.*

Proof Let F be a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $SMG(J)$. We show that it is also a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $WMG(J)$.

Let $(M_1, N_1, \ldots, M_k, N_k, \ldots)$ be a play of $WMG(J)$ during which TWO used F as a remainder strategy. Put $M_1^* = M_1$ and $M_{k+1}^* = M_{k+1} \cup (N_1 \cup \ldots \cup N_k)$ for each k. Then $(M_1^*, N_1, \ldots, M_k^*, N_k, \ldots)$ is a play of $SMG(J)$ during which TWO used the winning remainder strategy F. It follows that $\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k \subseteq \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} N_k$, so that TWO won the F-play of $WMG(J)$. ■

We now restrict ourselves to the rules of $WMG(J)$. As with $WMEG(J)$, a winning remainder strategy for TWO in the game $WMG(J)$ gives rise to the existence of a winning coding strategy for TWO. In general, the statement that player TWO has a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMG(J)$ is stronger than the statement that TWO has a winning coding strategy. To see this, recall that TWO has a winning coding strategy in $WMG([\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0})$ (see Theorem 2 of [S2]). But according to the next theorem, TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMG([\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0})$.

Theorem 12 (Just) *If $\kappa \geq \aleph_1$, then TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMG([\kappa]^{<\aleph_0})$.*

Proof Let F be a remainder strategy for TWO. For each $\alpha < \omega_1$ we put

$$\Phi(\alpha) = \sup(\cup\{F(\alpha \backslash T) : T \in [\alpha]^{<\aleph_0}\} \cup \alpha).$$

Then $\Phi(\alpha) \geq \alpha$ for each such α. Choose a closed, unbounded set $C \subset \omega_1$ such that:

1. $\Phi(\gamma) < \alpha$ whenever $\gamma < \alpha$ are elements of C, and
2. each element of C is a limit ordinal.

Then, by repeated use of Fodor's pressing down lemma, we inductively define a sequence $((\phi_1, S_1, T_1), \ldots, (\phi_n, S_n, T_n), \ldots)$ such that:

1. $C \supset S_1 \supset \ldots \supset S_n \supset \ldots$ are stationary subsets of ω_1,
2. $F(\alpha) \cap \alpha = T_1$ for each $\alpha \in S_1$, and
3. $F(\alpha \backslash (T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_n)) = T_{n+1}$ for each n and each $\alpha \in S_n$.

Put $\xi = \sup(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n) + \omega$. Choose $\alpha_n \in S_n$ so that $\xi \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \ldots < \alpha_n < \ldots$. By the construction above we have:

1. $F(\alpha_1) \cap \xi = T_1$ and
2. $F(\alpha_{n+1} \backslash (T_1 \cup \ldots \cup T_n)) \cap \xi = T_{n+1}$ for each n.

But then $(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n) \cap \xi \subset \xi = (\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n) \cap \xi$, so that TWO lost this play of $WMG([\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0})$. ■

For a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \langle J \rangle$, the game $WMG(\mathcal{A}, J)$ proceeds just like $WMG(J)$, except that ONE must now choose meager sets from $\mathcal{A}$ only. The proof of Theorem 12 gives a cofinal family $\mathcal{A}$ such that TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in the game $WMG(\mathcal{A}, [\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0})$. This should be contrasted with Theorem 7, which implies that there are many uncountable cardinals κ such that for some cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset [\kappa]^{\aleph_0}$, TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMG(\mathcal{A}, [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0})$.

Theorem 13 *If TWO has a winning coding strategy in $WMG(J)$, and if there is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset \langle J \rangle$ such that $A \Delta B \notin J$ whenever $A \neq B$ are elements of $\mathcal{A}$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMG(\mathcal{A}, J)$.*

Proof Let F be a winning coding strategy for TWO in $WMG(J)$, and let $\mathcal{A} \subset \langle J \rangle$ be a cofinal family as in the hypothesis of the theorem. If B is not in $\mathcal{A}$, but there is an $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $B \subset A$ and $A \backslash B \in J$, then this A is unique on account of the properties of $\mathcal{A}$.

Define a remainder strategy G for TWO as follows: Let $B \in \langle J \rangle$ be given.

1. $G(B) = F(\emptyset, B)$ if $B \in \mathcal{A}$,
2. $G(B) = F(A \backslash B, A)$ if $B \notin \mathcal{A}$, but $B \subset A$ and $A \backslash B \in J$ for an $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and
3. $G(B) = \emptyset$ in all other circumstances.

Then G is a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $WMG(\mathcal{A}, J)$. ■

Corollary 14 *Let λ be a cardinal number of countable cofinality. For each $\kappa \geq \lambda$, there is a cofinal family $\mathcal{A} \subset [\kappa]^{\lambda}$ such that TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $WMG(\mathcal{A}, J)$.*

Proof Write $\kappa = \cup_{\alpha<\kappa} S_\alpha$ where $\{S_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a disjoint collection of sets, each of cardinality λ. For each $A \in [\kappa]^{\lambda}$, put $A^* = \cup_{\alpha \in A} S_\alpha$. Then $\mathcal{A} = \{A^* : A \in [\kappa]^{\lambda}\}$ is a cofinal subset of $[\kappa]^{<\lambda}$ which has the properties required in Theorem 13. The result now follows from that theorem and the fact that TWO has a winning coding strategy in $WMG([\kappa]^{<\lambda})$ - see [S4]. ■

It is worth noting that Corollary 14 is a result in ordinary set theory, whereas we used the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis in Corollary 10.

4 The very strong game, VSG(J).

Moves by player TWO in the game $VSG(J)$ (introduced in [B-J-S]) consist of pairs of the form $(S, T) \in \langle J \rangle \times J$, while those of ONE are elements of $\langle J \rangle$. A sequence

$$(O_1, (S_1, T_1), O_2, (S_2, T_2), \ldots)$$

is a play of $VSG(J)$ if:

1. $O_{n+1} \supseteq S_n \cup T_n$, and
2. $O_n, S_n \in \langle J \rangle$ and $T_n \in J$ for each n.

Player TWO wins such a play if

$$\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} O_n \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n.$$

A strategy F is a remainder strategy for TWO in $VSG(J)$ if

$$(S_{n+1}, T_{n+1}) = F(O_{n+1} \backslash (\cup_{j=1}^{n} T_n))$$

for each n.

For $X \in \langle J \rangle$ we write $F(X) = (F_1(X), F_2(X))$ when F is a remainder strategy for TWO in $VSG(J)$. When F is a winning remainder strategy for TWO, we may assume that it has the following properties:

1. $F_1(X) \cap F_2(X) = \emptyset$; for G is a winning remainder strategy if $G_1(X) = F_1(X) \backslash F_2(X)$ and $G_2(X) = F_2(X)$ for each X.
2. $X \backslash F_2(X) \subseteq F_1(X)$; for G is a winning remainder strategy if $G_1(X) = (X \cup F_1(X)) \backslash F_2(X)$ and $G_2(X) = F_2(X)$ for each X.

The following Lemma describes a property which every winning remainder strategy of player TWO for the game $VSG(J)$ must have.

Lemma 15 *Assume that $J \subset \langle J \rangle \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ and let F be a winning remainder strategy for TWO in the game $VSG(J)$. Then the following assertion holds.*

> *For each $x \in S$ there exist a $C_x \in \langle J \rangle$ and a $D_x \in J$ such that:*
>
> 1. *$C_x \cap D_x = \emptyset$ and*
> 2. *$x \in F_2(B)$ for each $B \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $C_x \subseteq B$ and $D_x \cap B = \emptyset$.*

Proof Let F be a remainder strategy of TWO, but assume the negation of the conclusion of the lemma. We also assume that for each $X \in \langle J \rangle$, $X \backslash F_2(X) \subseteq F_1(X)$ and $F_1(X) \cap F_2(X) = \emptyset$.

Choose an $x \in S$ witnessing this negation. Then there is for each $C \in \langle J \rangle$ and for each $D \in J$ with $x \in C$ and $C \cap D = \emptyset$ a $B \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $B \cap D = \emptyset$, $C \subseteq B$ and $x \notin F_2(B)$. We now construct a sequence $\langle (B_k, C_k, D_k, M_k, S_k, N_k) : k \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ as follows: (we go through the first three steps of the construction for clarity, before stating the general requirements for the sequence)

Put $C_1 = \{x\}$ and $D_1 = \emptyset$. Choose $B_1 \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $C_1 \subseteq B_1$ and $x \notin F_2(B_1)$. Put $M_1 = B_1$ and $(S_1, N_1) = F(M_1)$. This defines $(B_1, C_1, D_1, M_1, S_1, N_1)$.

Put $C_2 = S_1$ and $D_2 = N_1$. Choose $B_2 \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $C_2 \subseteq B_2$, $D_2 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$, and $x \notin F_2(B_2)$. Put $M_2 = B_2 \cup D_2$ and $(S_2, N_2) = F(M_2 \backslash N_1)$. This defines $(B_2, C_2, D_2, M_2, S_2, N_2)$.

Put $D_3 = (N_1 \cup N_2)$ and $C_3 = S_2 \backslash D_3$. Choose $B_3 \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $C_3 \subseteq B_3$, $D_3 \cap B_3 = \emptyset$, and $x \notin F_2(B_3)$. Put $M_3 = B_3 \cup D_3$ and $(S_3, N_3) = F(M_3 \backslash D_3)$. This defines $(B_3, C_3, D_3, M_3, S_3, N_3)$.

Let $k \geq 3$ be given, and assume that

$$(B_1, C_1, D_1, M_1, S_1, N_1), \ldots, (B_k, C_k, D_k, M_k, S_k, N_k)$$

have been chosen so that:

1. $D_{j+1} = (N_1 \cup \ldots \cup N_j) \in J$,
2. $C_{j+1} = S_j \backslash D_{j+1} \in \langle J \rangle$ and $x \in C_{j+1}$ for $j < k$,
3. $C_j \subseteq B_j$, while $x \notin F_2(B_j)$ and $B_j \cap D_j = \emptyset$, and
4. $M_j = B_j \cup D_j$ and
5. $(S_j, N_j) = F(M_j \backslash D_j)$ for $j \leq k$, and
6. $(B_1, C_1, D_1, M_1, S_1, N_1)$ and $(B_2, C_2, D_2, M_2, S_2, N_2)$ are as above.

Put $D_{k+1} = \cup_{j=1}^{k} N_j$ and $C_{k+1} = S_k \backslash D_{k+1}$. By hypothesis there is a $B_{k+1} \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $C_{k+1} \subseteq B_{k+1}$, $B_{k+1} \cap D_{k+1} = \emptyset$, and $x \notin F_2(B_{k+1})$. Put $M_{k+1} = B_{k+1} \cup D_{k+1}$, and put $(S_{k+1}, N_{k+1}) = F(M_{k+1} \backslash (N_1 \cup \ldots \cup N_k))$.

Then the sequence

$$(B_1, C_1, D_1, M_1, S_1, N_1), \ldots, (B_{k+1}, C_{k+1}, D_{k+1}, M_{k+1}, S_{k+1}, N_{k+1})$$

still satisfies properties 1 through 6 above. Continuing like this we obtain an infinite sequence which satisfies these. But then

$$(M_1, (S_1, N_1), \ldots, M_k, (S_k, N_k), \ldots)$$

is a play of $VSG(J)$ during which player TWO used the remainder strategy F; this play is moreover lost by TWO because TWO never covered the point x. This proves the contrapositive of the lemma. ■

Theorem 16 (Galvin) *For $\kappa > \aleph_1$, TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in $VSG([\kappa]^{<\aleph_0})$.*

Proof Let F be a remainder strategy for TWO. If it were winning, choose for each $x \in \kappa$ a $D_x \in [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0}$ and a $C_x \in [\kappa]^{\leq\aleph_0}$ such that:

1. $C_x \cap D_x = \emptyset$,
2. $x \in C_x$ and
3. $x \in F_2(B)$ for each $B \in [\kappa]^{\leq\aleph_0}$ such that $B \cap D_x = \emptyset$ and $C_x \subseteq B$.

Now $(D_x : x \in \kappa)$ is a family of finite sets. By the Δ-system lemma we find an $S \in [\kappa]^{\kappa}$ and a finite set R such that $(D_x : x \in S)$ is a Δ-system with root R. For $x \in S$ define:

$$f(x) = \{y \in S : D_y \cap C_x \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then $f(x)$ is a countable set and $x \notin f(x)$ for each $x \in S$. By Hajnal's set-mapping theorem we find $T \in [S]^{\kappa}$ such that $C_x \cap D_y = \emptyset$ for all $x, y \in T$.

Let $K \in [T]^{\aleph_0}$ be given, and put $B = \cup_{x \in K} C_x$. Then $K \subseteq F_2(B)$, a contradiction. ■

Using similar ideas but with the appropriate cardinality assumption to ensure that the corresponding versions of the Δ-system lemma and the set-mapping theorems are true, one obtains also:

Theorem 17 *Let λ be a cardinal of countable cofinality. If $\kappa > 2^{\lambda}$, then TWO does not have a winning remainder strategy in $VSG([\kappa]^{<\lambda})$.*

Since for every cardinal λ of countable cofinality, and for each cardinal κ player TWO has a winning coding strategy in $WMG([\kappa]^{<\lambda})$ (see for example [S4]), Theorems 16 and 17 also show that the existence of a winning remainder strategy for TWO in $VSG(J)$ is a stronger statement than the existence of a winning coding strategy for TWO.

Problem 2 *Let λ be an uncountable cardinal of countable cofinality. Let κ be an infinite cardinal number such that $\lambda^{<\lambda} < cof([\kappa]^{\lambda}, \subset) \leq 2^{\lambda}$. Does TWO fail to have a winning remainder strategy in any of $WMEG([\kappa]^{<\lambda})$, $WMG([\kappa]^{<\lambda})$ or $VSG([\kappa]^{<\lambda})$?*

The following theorem shows that the κ in Theorem 16 cannot be decreased to ω_1. Thus, the rules of the very strong game are more advantageous to TWO than those of the other versions we considered earlier in this paper.

Theorem 18 *If $cof(\langle J\rangle, \subset) = \aleph_1$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $VSG(J)$.*

Proof We may assume that there is for each $X \in \langle J\rangle \backslash J$, a $Y \in \langle J\rangle \backslash J$ such that $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ (else, TWO has an easy winning remainder strategy even in $WMEG(J)$). Let $\prec$ be a well-ordering of S, the underlying set of our topological space. Choose two ω_1-sequences $(C_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ and $(x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1)$ such that:

1. $C_\alpha \subset C_\beta \in \langle J\rangle$,
2. $x_\alpha \in C_\beta$,
3. $x_\beta \notin C_\beta$,
4. $x_\alpha \prec x_\beta$ and
5. $C_\beta \backslash C_\alpha \notin J$ for all $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$, and
6. $\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is cofinal in $\langle J\rangle$.

For each $X \in \langle J\rangle$ we write $\beta(X)$ for $\min\{\alpha < \omega_1 : X \subseteq C_\alpha\}$. Put $\mathfrak{X} = \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$. Write Ω for $\omega_1 \backslash \omega$. Let F be a winning perfect information strategy for TWO in $REG(J)$, and let G be a winning perfect information strategy for TWO in $REG([\{x_\delta : \delta \in \Omega\}]^{<\aleph_0})$. We may assume that if σ is a sequence of length r of subsets of Ω, at least one of which is infinite, then $|G(\sigma)| \geq r$. We also define: $K_\beta = \{x_\gamma : \gamma \leq \beta\}$ for each $\beta \in \Omega$.

We define a remainder strategy H for TWO in $VSG(J)$. Thus, let $B \in \langle J\rangle$ be given.

1. If $B \in J$: Then put $H(B) = (C_{\beta(B)+\omega}, \{x_0, x_{\beta(B)}\})$
2. If $B \notin J$:

(a) If $\{n < \omega : x_n \notin B\} = \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$:
Let T be $\{x_{\beta(B)}\}$ together with the first $\leq k+1$ elements of $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \Omega\}\backslash B$. Put

$$S = T \cup (\cup\{G(\sigma) : \sigma \in {}^{\leq k+2}(\{K_\delta : x_\delta \in T\}),$$

a set in $[\{x_\delta : \delta \in \Omega\}]^{<\aleph_0}$. Let p be the cardinality of S. Then define

$$\overline{S} = \{x_0, \dots, x_p\} \cup S \cup ((\cup\{F(\sigma) : \sigma \in {}^{\leq p}(\{C_\alpha : x_\alpha \in S\})\})\backslash \mathfrak{X}).$$

Put $H(B) = (C_{\beta(B)+\omega}, \overline{S})$.

(b) If $\{n < \omega : x_n \notin B\}$ is not a finite initial segment of ω: Then we put $H(B) = (C_{\beta(B)+\omega}, \{x_0, x_{\beta(B)}$.

To see that H is a winning remainder strategy for TWO, consider a play

$$(O_1, (S_1, T_1), \dots, O_n, (S_n, T_n), \dots)$$

where $(S_1, T_1) = H(O_1)$ and $(S_{n+1}, T_{n+1}) = H(O_{n+1}\backslash(\cup_{j=1}^n S_j)$ for each n.

For convenience we put

- $W_0 = T_0 = \emptyset$ and $W_{n+1} = W_n \cup T_{n+1}$,
- $B_n = O_n \backslash W_n$,
- $\beta_n = \beta(B_n)$ and $\alpha_n = \beta_n + \omega$

for each n

Note that if B_j is such that $\{n \in \omega : x_n \notin B_j\}(= \{0, 1, \dots, k_j\}$ say) is a finite initial segment of ω, then the same is true for B_{j+1}. It follows that (S_j, T_j) is defined by Case 2(a) for each $j > 1$, and that $(k_j : j \in \mathbb{N})$ is an increasing sequence. It further follows that $\{x_{\beta_1}, \dots, x_{\beta_j}\} \subset T_j$ for these j. This in turn implies that:

1. $\cup_{j=1}^\infty F(C_{\beta_1}, \dots, C_{\beta_j})\backslash \mathfrak{X} \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^\infty T_n$,
2. $\cup_{j=1}^\infty G(K_{\beta_1}, \dots, K_{\beta_j}) \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^\infty T_n$, and
3. $\{x_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^\infty T_n$.

But then $\cup_{n=1}^\infty O_n \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^\infty T_n$. ■

Corollary 19 *TWO has a winning remainder strategy in* $VSG([\omega_1]^{<\aleph_0})$

Using the methods of this paper we can also show that if $J \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ is a free ideal such that there is an $A \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $cof(\langle J \rangle, \subset) \leq |J\lceil_A|$, then TWO has a winning remainder strategy in $VSG(J)$.

Corollary 20 *For every* T_1*-topology on* ω_1*, without isolated points, TWO has a winning remainder strategy in* $VSG(J)$*.*

References

[B-J-S] T. Bartoszynski, W. Just and M. Scheepers, *Strategies with limited memory in Covering games and the Banach-Mazur game: k-tactics*, submitted to **The Canadian Journal of Mathematics.**

[E-H-M-R] P. Erdös, A. Hajnal, A. Mate and R. Rado, *Combinatorial Set Theory: Partition Relations for Cardinals*, **North - Holland** (1984).

[K] P. Koszmider, *On coherent families of finite-to-one functions*, to appear in **Journal of Symbolic Logic.**

[S1] M. Scheepers, *Meager-nowhere dense games (I): n-tactics*, **The Rocky Mountain J. of Math.** 22 (1992),...

[S2] M. Scheepers, *Meager-nowhere dense games (II): coding strategies*, **Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.** 112 (1991), 1107-1115.

[S3] M. Scheepers, *Concerning n-tactics in the countable-finite game*, **The Journal of Symbolic Logic.** 56 (1991), 786-794.

[S4] M. Scheepers, *Meager-nowhere dense games (IV): n-tactics and coding strategies*, in preparation.

[W] N. H. Williams, *Combinatorial Set Theory*, **North - Holland** (1977).